THE EVEN START ACT—H.R. 2535

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 2535

SCHOOL EXCELLENCE AND REFORM ACT

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, NOVEMBER 20, 1985

Serial No. 99-82

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

58-703 O WASHINGTON : 1986

H341-55

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
RICK BOUCHER, Virginia
GEORGE A. HAYES, Illinois
CARL C. PERKINS, Kentucky
TERRY L. BRUCE, Illinois
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York
MERVYN M. DYMALLY, California
DENNIS E. ECKART, Ohio
TIMOTHY J. PENNY, Minnesota
CHESTER G. ATKINS, Massachusetts

JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
ROD CHANDLER, Washington
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa
JOHN R. McKERNAN, JR., Maine
RICHARD K. ARMEY, Texas
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
RICK BOUCHER, Virginia
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
CARL C. PERKINS, Kentucky
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York
DENNIS E. ECKART, Ohio

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
ROD CHANDLER, Washington
JOHN R. McKERNAN, JR., Maine
RICHARD K. ARMEY, Texas
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
(Ex Officio)

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held in Washington, DC, on November 20, 1985	1
Text of H.R. 2535	1
Statement of:	
Chafee, Hon. John H., U.S. Senator, State of Rhode Island	5
Darling, Sharon, director, Division of Adult and Community Education, Kentucky State Department of Education	15
Miller, James, director, Division of Education Services, Ohio State Department of Education	23
Paratore, Dr. Jeanne, School of Education, Boston University	14
Woods, Nancy, project coordinator, adult literacy project, Pennsylvania	20
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, et cetera:	
Darling, Sharon, director, Division of Adult and Community Education, Kentucky Department of Education, prepared statement of	18
Miller, James W., director, Division of Educational Services, Ohio Department of Education, prepared statement of	25
National Education Association, prepared statement of	33

HEARING ON THE EVEN START ACT—H.R. 2535

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1985

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY,
AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met pursuant to call, in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Augustus Hawkins (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Hawkins, Martinez, Perkins, Jeffords, Goodling, Gunderson, McKernan, Armey, and Fawell.

Staff present: John F. Jennings, staff counsel; Nancy Kober, legislative specialist; Reta Lewis, research associate; Andy Hartman, legislative associate.

[The text of H.R. 2535 follows:]

H.R. 2535

A BILL To establish a pilot program to develop methods for parents who are in adult literacy programs, and who have preschool-age children who may be educationally at risk, to acquire the skills necessary to work in the home with those children

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Even Start Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) successful education depends on the learning that occurs at home;

(2) research indicates that many parents are not full partners in the education of their own children;

(3) this participation can be increased by helping parents to acquire specific skills and strategies needed to work with their children;

(4) 23,000,000 adults, many of them parents, lack basic literacy skills;

(5) studies have shown that many children begin school with fewer academic abilities than their peers and fail to make up that difference over their school career; and

(6) medical, social, or nutritional problems which might hinder a child's ability to obtain an even start in school must be identified early.

(b) PURPOSES.—It is therefore the purpose of this Act to successfully combine adult basic education for parents and school readiness training for children into a single educational program by—

(1) developing model adult basic education programs;

(2) having a component designed to assist parents to be more effective in preparing their children for entrance into school;

(3) sharing with parents knowledge and skills that have been found to enhance a child's learning; and

(4) providing parents with supervised opportunities to practice these techniques at the learning center and in the family's home.

SEC. 3. USE OF FUNDS.

(a) COMBINED PARENT AND CHILD EDUCATION SERVICES.—Funds made available to a grant recipient under this Act shall be used to provide a program of adult literacy training which includes as a major component involving parents and children together in an effort to enhance the likelihood of educational achievement.

(b) PROGRAM ELEMENTS.—Each program provided by a grant recipient under this Act shall include the following elements:

(1) identifying and recruiting eligible participants;

(2) screening and preparation of parents and children for participation, including testing, referral to necessary counseling, and related services;

(3) designing programs and providing support services to suit the participants' work and other responsibilities, including—

(A) scheduling and locating services to allow joint participation by parents and children;

(B) child care; and

(C) transportation;

(4) establishing instruction programs that promote adult literacy, equip parents to support the education and growth of their children, and prepare children for success in regular school programs; and

(5) providing and monitoring integrated instructional services to participants through home-based programs.

(c) ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.—Eligible participants in programs provided by a grant recipient under this Act are families—

(1) that include a parent who is eligible for participation in an adult basic education program under the Adult Education Act; and

(2) that reside—

(A) in a school attendance area designated for receipt of funds under chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981; and

(B) with a child aged 4 or 5.

SEC. 4. SELECTION OF GRANT RECIPIENTS.

(a) ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS.—Any agency, organization, or institution that—

(1) operates an adult basic education program under the Adult Education Act; and

(2) serves an area—

(A) in which the rate of unemployment exceeds the national average rate of unemployment; and

(B) at least 75 percent or more of which is comprised of school attendance areas designated for receipt of funds under chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981;

is eligible to apply for a grant under this Act.

(b) GRANT APPLICATION.—(1) To be selected as a grant recipient, an eligible applicant shall submit an application in such form and containing or accompanied by such information as the Secretary may require.

(2) Such application shall include a demonstration by the applicant that—

(A) the applicant has the qualified personnel required (i) to develop, administer, and implement the program required by this Act, and (ii) to provide special training necessary to prepare staff for the program;

(B) the applicant can coordinate programs under the Adult Education Act with programs under chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, and with other related programs such as health care, nutrition, child abuse, and substance abuse control;

(C) in the case of an applicant that is not a local educational agency, the applicant plans and operates such programs in coordination with the applicable State and local educational agency.

(3) In addition, such application shall include a plan of operation for the program which includes—

(A) a description of the program goals;

(B) a description of the activities and services which will be provided by the program (including training and preparation of staff); and

(C) a statement of the methods which will be used (i) to ensure that the program will serve those eligible participants most in need of the activities and services provided by this Act, and (ii) to provide services under this Act to special populations, such as individuals with limited English proficiency and handicapped individuals.

(c) SELECTION OF GRANT RECIPIENTS.—(1) From the applications submitted in accordance with subsection (b), the Secretary shall select not less than 15 nor more than 20 for final review. Of the applications so selected, two-thirds shall be from urban areas and one-third from rural areas.

(2) Such final review shall be conducted by a review panel composed of the Secretary and the following individuals appointed by the Secretary:

(A) a State director of programs under chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981;

(B) a State director of programs under the Adult Education Act;

(C) a director of a local program under such chapter;

(D) a director of a local program under such Act;

(E) two chief State school officers;

(F) a representative from a local Parent-Teacher Association;

(G) a representative from an institution of higher education with training in early childhood education; and

(H) a representative from an institution of higher education with training in adult literacy training.

(3) The review panel shall select three applications for the receipt of funds under this Act.

SEC. 5. PROGRAM AGREEMENTS.

(a) PROGRAM AGREEMENT REQUIRED.—An eligible applicant whose application has been selected for funding under section 4(c) shall enter into a program agreement with the Secretary in accordance with this section.

(b) CONTENTS OF PROGRAM AGREEMENT.—Each program agreement under this section shall—

(1) contain such information and assurances as the Secretary may require to ensure compliance with the requirements of this Act;

(2) specify that participants in the program under this Act will be enrolled for a period of not less than 12 months, beginning at any time during or after the beginning of the school year;

(3) assure that the grant recipient will comply with evaluation and dissemination requirements prescribed under section 6;

(4) contain assurances that the grant recipient will—

(A) provide not less than 25 percent of the cost of the program for the third year of operation;

(B) provide not less than 50 percent of the cost of the program for the fourth year of operation; and

(C) continue to operate the program after the expiration of assistance under this Act, if the program has been demonstrated to be effective.

SEC. 6. EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION OF RESULTS OF PILOT PROJECTS.

(a) EVALUATION REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall provide for the evaluation of programs under this Act in order to determine their effectiveness in providing—

(1) for the participation of special populations;

(2) adult education services;

(3) for the training of parents to work with their children;

(4) home based programs involving parents and child;

(5) coordination with related service programs; and

(6) for the training of personnel in the appropriate skill areas.

(b) CONDUCT OF EVALUATIONS.—The evaluation shall be conducted by individuals not directly involved in the administration of the program or project operation under this Act. These outside evaluators and the program administrators shall jointly develop a set of evaluation criteria which provide for appropriate analysis of the factors located in subsection (a). When possible, these evaluations shall include comparisons with appropriate control groups.

(c) OBJECTIVE MEASURES.—In order to determine a program's effectiveness in achieving its stated goals, the evaluation shall contain objective measures of such goals and, whenever feasible, will obtain the specific views of program participants about such programs.

(d) DISSEMINATION.—The results of the evaluation conducted under this section shall, not later than the end of fiscal year 1992, be submitted to the national diffusion network, in the form required for consideration, for possible dissemination.

SEC. 7. AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR EVEN START PROGRAM.

(a) RESERVATION FROM ADULT EDUCATION FUNDS.—The Secretary shall reserve $1,000,000 of the amount available for programs under section 304 of the Adult Education Act for each of the fiscal years 1987 through 1991 to carry out this Act.

(b) RESERVATION FROM CHAPTER 1 FUNDS.—The Secretary shall reserve $2,000,000 of the amount available for evaluation and studies under chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 for each of the fiscal years 1987 through 1991 to carry out this Act.

(c) REAPPROPRIATION PROHIBITED.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply with respect to funds appropriated before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act, the terms—

(1) "local educational agency" has the meaning given such term by section 595(a)(4) of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981;

(2) "State educational agency" has the meaning given such term by section 595(a)(3) of such Act; and

(3) "institution of higher education" has the meaning given such term by section 481(a)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Mr. GOODLING. I would like to call this hearing to order on a bill I have introduced, H.R. 2535, the Even Start Act. During the 3 days of joint House/Senate hearings on the problems of illiteracy a common theme was voiced by a number of the witnesses. That was, if we are serious about reducing illiteracy and preventing its occurrence in another generation, then we must focus on adults and their children.

In the words of Dr. Sticht:

> We must recognize that both the education of parents and their children is needed if children are to enter the school system with the competencies needed to succeed. From this point of view, adult literacy programs should be regarded as compensatory education for the adults' children.

The Even Start Act translates this recognition into Federal support for several demonstration programs aimed at working with parents who lack basic skills and working with their young children. Not only do the experts agree that this is the way to go, but I ran a similar program as a superintendent of schools in Pennsylvania and saw firsthand its positive results.

There's good evidence that children are not getting to school on an equal footing; 500,000 first graders are in Chapter 1 programs, because they are already lagging behind their peers on basic academic skills. About 1 million first grade children actually are eligible and could benefit from chapter 2.

Results from the recent report of the National Assessment of Educational Progress indicates that 6 percent of 9-year-olds, third and fourth graders, could not do rudimentary reading exercises. 35 percent of this group could not read at the basic level.

A partial explanation for this is the fact that more children are coming to school from families where conditions exist that often lead to educational difficulties.

One of every four preschoolers is living in poverty. A growing number of children are living with only one parent. Within this group, there is a larger number of single, teenage parents. An increasing number of students are coming to school speaking a language other than English.

In many cases, there is a combination of these factors in a single family. The Even Start Act would assist parents who do not have basic literacy skills while at the same time working with these parents and their children so that they might become true partners in their education. Without such an approach we are simply playing

catch up and achievement data shows that for many of these youngsters this is a losing game.

This bill, the Even Start Act, would first of all reserve $1 million from the Adult Education Act and $2 million from chapter 1 for the years 1987 through 1991. The participants in this program would be targeted parents who would qualify for assistance under the Adult Education Act, reside in a chapter 1 attendance area, and have a child aged 4 or 5.

Programs would be run by an agency which is operating an adult education program. The legislation specifies that these agencies cooperate with a number of other agencies, chapter 1, health care, substance abuse, et cetera, to assure that their areas of expertise are taken advantage of.

A panel of experts from several relevant fields will select three applicants on a competitive basis. Two of these must be from urban areas and one from a rural area.

The value of this demonstration largely rests on its evaluation and the dissemination of the resulting information to interested parties.

I would like to indicate also, as I said to the Senator, this is a little step toward a big step that I hope to introduce in the near future which would be all encompassing and would be attacking this illiteracy problem from every possible angle, as soon as I figure how we'd pay for it. I'm happy to have with us today Senator Chafee who is introducing or has, I'm not sure which, had introduced similar legislation on the Senate side. Senator, without further ado, we will hear your testimony so you can get back over, and hopefully the chairman will come in while you're talking.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN H. CHAFEE, U.S. SENATOR, STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

Senator CHAFEE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank you and Chairman Hawkins for giving me this opportunity to testify on H.R. 2535, the Even Start Act.

First, I want to commend you and thank you for introducing this exciting legislation. I prepared, with your help, the Senate version, S. 1723, which I recently introduced along with the cosponsorship of Senator Lawton Chiles of Florida, and Senator Charles Mathias of Maryland.

Although our Nation's growing illiteracy problem does not receive as much attention as issues like arms control and the budget deficit, its seriousness should not be underestimated, and nobody knows that better than you, Mr. Chairman. As the economy steams forward with increased emphasis on information and communications, millions of adult Americans who cannot read are being left behind.

Usually they are people who grow up poor and find themselves locked into poverty by their inability to read even the simple questions on a job application. Often they are minorities for whom illiteracy is another disadvantage in the struggle to improve their condition. Too frequently, their illiteracy denies them the chance to become self sufficient and productive citizens, and they become dependent on social welfare or turn to crime.

Perhaps more public attention would be focused on adult illiteracy if more people were aware that each year we spend an estimated $6 billion on child welfare costs and unemployment compensation for illiterate adults unqualified for work. Or that 50 percent of our prison population is functionally illiterate; and I'm informed that functionally illiterate means they can't read.

It isn't just that they can't read very well. They can't read, period. So 50 percent of our prison population can't read, and they're maintained in prison at a cost of $6 billion a year, another $6 billion.

Numbers cannot, however, convey the tragedy of illiteracy and its devastating effect on individual lives. I believe that in order to gain a true understanding of this problem, and to effectively combat it, we must move away from statistics and abstractions. We must look at the people who are not learning to read, who are suffering the frustration and despair of illiteracy in a society that relies so much on the written word.

We must determine why, despite our extensive system of public education—extensive and expensive—why there are at least 23 million illiterate adults in America—1 out of every 5 American adults are illiterate, and millions more young people are headed in the same direction. We've got to identify where and how their problems exist and begin.

Now the Even Start Act is based on the belief that illiteracy, like many of our society's worst problems, as you so well point out, Mr. Chairman, begins in the home. Most illiterate adults are not being reached by existing adult education programs, and many of them inadvertently are passing on illiteracy to their children. Raised in homes in which reading is never done, the children of illiterates often begin school at a disadvantage, quickly fall behind their classmates, and cannot turn to their parents for help because their parents can't read.

These are the children who drop out of school, never become readers and enter adult life with bleak prospects for employment and advancement. This bill recognizes that parents are the best teachers. Parents dominate their children's earliest years and equip them with the basic skills that they have when they begin school.

Children enrolled in chapter 1 programs benefit the most from formal remedial instruction if what they learn in school is reinforced at home, and I think we all recognize that. Without this crucial link, that is without the help from home, the children of illiterates are at great risk of falling behind and becoming illiterates themselves.

Pilot adult literacy programs funded under Even Start will teach reading to parents who are poor readers or nonreaders and equip them to work on basic reading skills at home with their children. The Senate version of your bill, Mr. Chairman, differs in a number of specifics which I will describe in a moment, but the overall program is the same.

The two bills share the following features. Eligible agencies must already operate an adult basic education program. This modestly priced legislation does not call for a big, new, costly program.

Second, participants must have young children who are eligible for chapter 1 programs. Third, the adult basic education center must serve an area where unemployment rates are high and the need for literacy training is great. Fourth, selected applicants must show that they can coordinate Even Start Programs with chapter 1 and other related programs and provide appropriate support services.

Now, the Senate version differs from yours in the following respects, which aren't major. We increase the funding from $3 million to $5 million and call for the money to be taken from chapter 2 rather than from chapter 1 and the adult basic education program.

I believe there is a need for greater funding because of the strong interest the bill has generated since it was first introduced, and because more money will bring Even Start to more areas of the country. We make this a chapter 2 program because Even Start is exactly the kind of small innovative program for which chapter 2 was intended.

I would think we would be working at cross purposes if we took money from chapter 1 and the adult basic education program to fund this.

A second difference: While your bill requires that participating parents have children who are between the ages of 4 and 8, we make it between 2 and 8. The rationale for this is a parent who begins the 1 year program with a 2-year-old child will finish it when the child is at an ideal age, 3 years old, to take advantage of the home learning before the start of school.

Third, your bill requires that an applicant agency, adult basic education agency, serve an area in which the rate of unemployment exceeds the national rate and in which 75 percent of the school attendance receives chapter 1 funds. It seemed to me that was a little restrictive. We require that the selected applicants serve areas with generally high unemployment and with a great need for literacy programs, and that the children of adult participants attend a school in which 20 percent of the students are eligible for chapter 1.

These changes will allow Even Start to serve cities and towns which contain pockets of poverty and high illiteracy rates, but which might not meet the criteria of your bill. In any case, I do not foresee affluent areas competing for these funds, since those areas don't have significant illiteracy problems.

Let me just emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that none of this is written in stone. The two bills are essentially the same, and I am certain we can work out the differences. I wish to thank you and this subcommittee for inviting me here today. I think we all share this deep concern about adult illiteracy. Frankly, it's a real crisis, and I think with this small start, we can find out how to innovate programs to break the intergenerational cycle of illiteracy.

I want to thank you and the other members of the committee.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Senator Chafee. Allow me to speak from some personal experience. My mother was born in this country, never went a day to school in this country, she raised nine children while my dad was out working to support them.

The only contact we had in those early years was with my mother who you might say was illiterate. So, I know that it was difficult for all of us in our family when we got started in school to catch up with the rest of the people. We started from two aspects, one from speaking a language other than English, and having that transition period, the adjustment that we had to make from thinking in one language to another and back and forth, so I know there is a disadvantage, and I think this is a tremendous idea, but here again, we get into the question of money.

Mr. Goodling's bill takes moneys from existing programs. Your bill, I understand, does not. It takes from a block grant.

Senator CHAFEE. Our bill would take it from the chapter 2, and this was a block grant which was created for the improvement of elementary and secondary schools. It's my understanding that the chapter 2 money has been rather spread around and really isn't concentrating in the poorer schools the way originally it was intended to. I think everybody gets a little piece of it.

I know in my home State, some of the more affluent school districts are getting a slice of chapter 2. Now, true, it is a block grant, and our program is a categorical grant. We've been taught that categorical grants are bad, because we're telling the local communities what to do, but we've got a real problem out there which frankly isn't being addressed, and the Federal Government is providing the money for it. I think this is a case where we're entitled to do a little specific direction.

Mr. MARTINEZ. I agree with you. It's not that they're not aware of it. I think they're aware of it. You know, you can't work with these kids coming into school and see that their deficient beginning isn't going to curtail their abilities as they go and cause them hardship in catching up. But, I think there is another aspect to it. Many school districts who are willing to do something about it don't have the money. Some school districts, of course depending on where it is, just simply don't do anything about it, because they're not told to, and I think that enters into it certainly.

There is one statement that Mr. Goodling made in his opening remarks in describing the bill that I would like to put a little emphasis on and ask you, the part where they come to school speaking another language, regardless of what that language is.

We're looking for moneys, and I would like your response to this. There is a 5-percent set-aside for innovative programs in the bilingual education program. Would there be a potential, do you think, to get moneys from that designated for this?

Senator CHAFEE. I just don't know. I don't know the answer to that. Is that a chapter 2 program?

Mr. MARTINEZ. No.

Senator CHAFEE. We don't deal with that in this legislation. I suppose any time you get dealing with the bilingual programs, you're stirring up a hornets nest. So we haven't gotten into that. We have just stayed with the chapter 2 moneys.

Mr. MARTINEZ. The reason I bring it up is because when you see a good program like this, because we get in an argument of where the moneys are coming from, we sometimes would kill a good program like this, and I would hate to see that happen, because I par-

ticularly just initially reviewing this, think it's a tremendous idea. Mr. Goodling?

Mr. GOODLING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In answer to your question, in the new bilingual bill, there is a family bilingual program I think that probably could be worked into this. We specifically tried to stay away from emphasizing the funding issue simply because we were afraid that if we spent much time on that issue, we will kill the program.

My hope is to get this meager program off the ground, because as I indicated before you came in, I have a huge program that I would like to dump on the lap of this committee in the very near future. I'm now figuring out how you finance it, and we are working on some ideas, but our hope was to get this small program started as quickly as possible. You know, when you talk about a recovery, it's hopeless to have a recovery in this country, unless we find some way to deal with the 25 to 60 million functionally illiterate people who used to be able to find jobs, and brought in fairly decent wages. That time is gone forever, and now with our high technology, et cetera, we are trying to steer away. It's as if we were walking on eggs on the financing part of it. It is important that we get Even Start kicked off and get it running so that we can then attack with the big program as soon as we get the little one off the ground.

Senator, I don't find any problems with your ways of financing or ours. All of those, I think, can be worked out, and it appears that we're both attacking the problems with the understanding that unless we attack the adult and the child together, we are never going to break the cycle. We have to quit piddling at little ends and get to the point where somehow or other we can break the cycle. I think both of our bills are a beginning, and just a meager beginning in that area, and I appreciate it. I will want to work very closely with you as we move this bill forward.

Senator CHAFEE. Thank you, Mr. Goodling.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Perkins.

Mr. PERKINS. Actually I'm interested in some information tidbits, if I could garner them here from whatever source. The idea obviously is a great one, trying to get it to the children, trying to get the parents together in conjunction with one another. I think that's great.

I would like to see a massive program as well. I question what specifically, Senator, is your program, the mechanics of it. I came today, because I was intrigued by this idea. I don't know very much about it. Are the mechanics such that the money is delivered to the local school systems, and they implement some sort of program that has not been defined as of yet, or what are the mechanics?

Senator CHAFEE. The mechanics are that we already have these agencies, these organizations that operate an adult basic education program. Maybe the counsel could help me here, but I think they're normally not school districts, are they?

In order to avoid setting up a whole new layer, we would operate through those ABE centers. You have to be an organization that does operate one of these ABE, adult basic education, units. We start with them, and of course, then the next requirement is that it must be in these areas of high unemployment where there is a siza-

ble number of youngsters who are in remedial programs in the schools. Then those who are running the Adult Basic Education Program take the parent and the child together. The parent must have a child in these ranges. Mr. Goodling's is from 4 to 8; mine is from 2 to 8. Then for a year, they work with the parent in teaching the parent how to read to some degree and how to convey the reading skills to a youngster. The parent will then have not only the incentive to read himself or herself, but will have the incentive to teach the child to get accustomed to reading and familiar with reading child's stories and so forth. So the child will have an interest in reading.

Mr. PERKINS. Are there any programs that do it jointly with the parent and child together?

Senator CHAFEE. If the child were older, you could do that, but if the child were younger, the answer would be no at this stage.

Mr. PERKINS. I would concur with Mr. Goodling in a side remark. It strikes me that one of the important things, one of the things that would really be helpful would be to try to get an interrelationship between the child and parent who are struggling together to try to get some sort of grasp and hold on this educational problem. I think that's something that at least we should be aware of and move forward in our legislation.

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. Jeffords? Mr. Jeffords, before you begin, could I make a statement please?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Certainly, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HAWKINS. I wish to apologize to the witnesses, and particularly to Mr. Goodling for a mistake apparently made, a clerical error. I had this hearing listed for 10 a.m. and I was almost on time for that, but certainly we looked forward to the hearing. Mr. Goodling has been pushing this hearing for a long time, and the Chair is very pleased to have his views and his ideas in connection with this proposal. I simply wish to apologize to him and to the rest of the committee. This is very unusual for the Chair, but nobody can be perfect all the time. Thank you. Mr. Jeffords.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would say that there's no one that comes closer to being perfect than you.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I certainly am also here because I think this is a very important concept. I'm very pleased that the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Rhode Island have introduced these proposals for consideration in this Congress.

I have been a follower of the pilot project, Follow Through, for a long time. We've had two programs in our State which have shown how valuable it can be to have the parents and the students working together; but it does not approach or try to take care of the problems which you indicate.

I was startled, as I'm sure everyone was, to find out what the illiteracy rates were within our own areas. I always thought Vermont was pretty far advanced, but found out that we have close to 25 percent illiteracy in my home county. I found this very staggering.

I think it's incredibly important that we do have this Even Start Program. One area I'm interested in is the funding differences.

You have talked about that Senator, but do you have any reasons to feel that your taking it from chapter 2 where we have about a $500 million appropriation versus chapter 1 where there's a $3.9 billion appropriation? I'm concerned about getting the bill passed and where our enemies will be least likely to find us vulnerable. Do you have any reasons to think chapter 2 is better than chapter 1?

Senator CHAFEE. The reason we went to chapter 2 was because chapter 2 was created for innovative reasons, to embark on innovative techniques, and for the improvement of elementary and secondary schools. Chapter 1, as you know, was to help these disadvantaged youngsters who were in the schools, and it seems to me if you take it out of chapter 1, you're taking it out of many schools that are in tough shape to start with. They need every nickel they can get, whereas in chapter 2, it seemed to me that this was more of an experimental fund, and that's exactly what we're doing here—experimenting.

The other point, and this may not be true across the Nation, but we have found—I'd be curious as to what you have found—in my State anyway, that the chapter 2 funds were not directed entirely to poorer communities they were spread out so that everybody is getting a piece of the pie, as I mentioned earlier, even some of the wealthier school districts.

Now that doesn't mean that they shouldn't experiment too, but it seems to me when we've got this terrible situation we must address. I must say that before I got into this, if somebody had told me that this number of Americans, 23 million adult Americans couldn't read, I would say that's just not so, because we don't encounter them. They mask it, they hide it in some fashion. Nobody goes around with a chestplate saying "I'm illiterate," but apparently they're there. No one disputes these facts.

So recognizing that, I just think it's fair to take some of these funds that were set aside as a block grant, and indeed cut down over the past 3 or 4 years, and go to this categorical grant. I know that's swimming against the tide to have categorical grants these days, but I think it's worth it here.

Mr. JEFFORDS. One last question. I have reason to believe that the administration may support this program, and I would just point out that to have the NEA and the administration on the same side of an innovative program would lead us to believe it's the best thing that's come along in a long time. I wonder if you have any information as to whether or not that is accurate, the administration may well support this new program?

Senator CHAFEE. I would be surprised if the administration would support this. I think taking it from chapter 2, adding a category into a block grant would be counter to the Department's philosophy and the administration's philosophy.

Mr. JEFFORDS. It's our understanding that yesterday a letter emanated from the Department indicating support for the concept. We haven't received it yet, but just to alert you so that you don't have any consequences from too much of a surprise.

Senator CHAFEE. Well, I would revel in that surprise.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Thank you. That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. McKernan?

Mr. MCKERNAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That may be one of those the check is in the mail kind of letters.

Senator, I just wanted to ask one question. You may or may not be familiar with a study done by the Committee for Economic Development which found that one of the greatest needs in this country was a program like Even Start, to try to identify those at-risk children before they get to school to give them the start that they're going to need when they get into formal education, and to work with parents and children to get them up to a level where they will be able to go through a school system in a lot better shape than they do now.

In fact, they found that there were 3.3 million illiterate minority children, and they found that there were 3 million unemployed minority youth. They drew a great correlation between those figures.

I wondered, given the conclusion also that a community would save the $5,000 or so it would cost to run one of these programs per child by the time that child graduated from high school just in savings to the community on other costs that are incurred by these children who drop out, whether you've given any thought to changing your proposal to some type of matching grant program. Would that be anything that you think we ought to be exploring, rather than just an outright grant program?

Senator CHAFEE. I think that's a good idea. As you know, this is just a very, very modest experimental program to see what kinds of techniques we ought to follow in trying to reach a solution. In other words, this is an experimental program, as I said, and I suppose that we might be able to entice some communities into it with a matching grant.

The trouble is that we've targeted it to the poorer communities, and the poorer communities probably don't have the money to come up with the matching funds, and the ones that come forward with the matching would be the richer communities which are the ones who are less worried about this problem. In the richer communities, you just don't get the illiteracy, and I just hate to have communities squeezed out because they can't come up with the match. Now maybe you could have a very modest match or something.

I think your point that communities are going to save in the end is right on target.

Mr. MCKERNAN. I appreciate that. Thank you.

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. Gunderson?

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I had a couple of questions I was going to ask, but I understand we have a witness who is still trying to pull off a miracle and catch a plane in half an hour, so I'm going to yield my questions at this time.

They skipped the plane or they've skipped testimony? Senator, I will proceed.

The interesting thing in your proposal as opposed to Mr. Goodling's is, as you've indicated, you go through chapter 2 rather than chapter 1. The question I would have regarding this is while you can make an argument that you ought not be taking money from chapter 1 when that's the clientele you're trying to help, on the other hand, there seems to be great merit to having the coordina-

tion in this type of program with the same people operating it at the Federal level within the chapter 1 program.

How would that coordination and implementation of the program at the Department of Education occur if it came through chapter 2 rather than chapter 1?

Senator CHAFEE. Well, in both pieces of legislation that coordination is required. Now, how specifically it would work out, I'm just not sure, but I've been informed by those who are familiar with it that this doesn't present a tremendous hurdle. I understand that the adult basic education people who are required under both Mr. Goodling's and my proposal to run this are already tied into the chapter 1 funds in some manner which I'll confess I'm not exactly sure of, but that has not been pointed out as a difficulty.

Mr. GUNDERSON. I hear what you're saying, but I must express a little concern that all the way down to the local school district level, the chapter 1 funds have such a different intent, and in essence, different constituency than chapter 2 funds do. I'm just not sure that you aren't embarking upon a potential problem with the coordination effort there.

Senator CHAFEE. Well, they're all for children, both the programs, and maybe a problem exists, and there will be other witnesses who may shed greater light on it with more experience than I have had. But those I've consulted with in putting this thing together have not seen that as a major concern. I may be sloughing over a real problem, but not intentionally.

Mr. GUNDERSON. I'm not suggesting that it absolutely is. I'm just inquiring about it, thank you.

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. Fawell?

Mr. FAWELL. I have no questions.

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. Armey?

Mr. ARMEY. No questions.

Chairman HAWKINS. Senator, I suppose that you've exhausted the questions of the members of this committee. Again, we apologize we were not here at the opening to greet you in the usual manner in which we are accustomed to greeting Senators, but we're delighted to have you.

Senator CHAFEE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and I want to say that I appreciate your letting me go ahead in your absence, because that was very, very helpful, and I appreciate it.

Chairman HAWKINS. We have a good committee, and they always respond when someone falls down. Thank you.

Senator CHAFEE. Thank you.

Chairman HAWKINS. The next witnesses will consist of a panel beginning with Dr. Jeanne Paratore, School of Education, Boston University; Ms. Sharon Darling, director of division of adult and community education, Kentucky State Department of Education; Ms. Nancy Woods, project coordinator of the adult literacy project, Pennsylvania; Mr. James Miller, director of the division of education services, the Ohio State Department of Education.

We appreciate the appearance of the witness. Dr. Paratore, my notes indicate that you have a time problem. Is that still holding?

Dr. PARATORE. It's better than it was. I'm trying for an 11:38 flight. I have a little bit of time.

Chairman HAWKINS. Let us begin with you. You're scheduled as the first witness anyway. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF DR. JEANNE PARATORE, SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, BOSTON UNIVERSITY

Dr. PARATORE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Dr. Jeanne Paratore. I am an assistant professor of education at Boston University and acting director of Collaborations for Literacy which is an intergenerational reading project. I am a member of the International Reading Association and represent that association here today.

I will address my remarks toward the professional issues outlined in the Even Start Act. As you review the regulations for this act, I ask you to consider the following. It's been said several times already this morning that the importance of a literate home environment has been well established in the field of education. In fact, reading research indicates that children who read early and continue to achieve in reading throughout the elementary grades are children who come from home environments in which an adult created an interest in books, read to children regularly, encouraged children to do reading-like activities, and ask questions, talked and listened. In fact, reading aloud to children has been identified as the single most important factor in preparing children for literacy.

Yet, again as was stated several times this morning, and I'll say it one more time, according to numerous statistics related to illiteracy in the United States, there exists millions of Americans who cannot read well enough to follow the directions on an aspirin bottle or to prepare a can of soup, certainly not well enough to share with children favorite tales of childhood and a literary heritage that should be theirs as citizens of the United States.

Thus the parents among these illiterate Americans are unable to build the home environments critical for success in early reading, unable to provide a model of successful reading, unable to instill in young children a positive attitude toward books and learning. Entering school without the same advantage and foundation enjoyed by children of literate parents, these children begin at a disadvantage and for many, the cycle of illiteracy continues.

Programs which document the success of parents as partners in education are not new. There exists study upon study to suggest that when parents are actively involved in children's literacy development, achievement scores increase significantly. What is new is the awareness that for a substantial number of parents, parent education requires first that we teach them basic literacy skills, and at the same time provide direct instruction on how to share these skills with their children.

Through this process we engaged in an intergenerational approach and link instruction for illiterate adults with a prevention program for the children. The success of such programs can be predicted on the basis of the professional literature related to the acquisition of beginning reading. In addition, there is preliminary data available from Collaborations for Literacy, the Boston University project which I direct, to support this program. Our data suggests that adults make progress toward literacy quickly by sharing

easy reading materials with children. Those who have had experience in working with adults in early literacy programs know that one of the greatest difficulties is finding appropriate materials. There is not very much out there on an easy reading level that adults are interested in reading.

When we ask them to read children's books to their children, we serve two purposes. We provide materials at the reading level they need, and we do not insult them by asking them to think that the materials are intended for them. The purpose is to share them with their children.

This shared experience provides an opportunity for legitimate and authentic practice for the adults. A second benefit, children extend the vocabulary and awareness of print necessary for successful acquisition of literacy skills. A third benefit, adults and children develop a positive attitude toward books and learning. Fourth, adults have improved attendance rates in tutoring programs.

Again, those familiar with adult literacy programs know that attendance can be difficult. The motivation to come on a regular basis can be a difficult issue. With the intergenerational approach, the motivation to be there on a regular basis is in place. And, finally, adults have improved retention rates in our tutoring program remaining in the program for a longer period of time.

In becoming a nation of readers, a recent report of the Commission on reading, the authors states, and I quote, "Parents play roles of inestimable importance in laying the foundation for learning to read. A parent is a child's first tutor in unraveling the fascinating puzzle of written language."

Through funding for intergenerational literacy programs, we will provide illiterate Americans an opportunity to assume the role that is so important in breaking the cycle of illiteracy in the United States. The International Reading Association stands ready to assist the committee in further developing this proposal. Thank you.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you. We will proceed with the other witnesses, and Dr. Paratore, at any point you think you must leave, just so indicate, and we will break in and accommodate you.

The second witness is Ms. Sharon Darling.

STATEMENT OF MS. SHARON DARLING, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF ADULT AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION, KENTUCKY STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Ms. DARLING. Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to testify here today on something that I feel is so important in changing education in this country in turning that cycle around that keeps repeating itself over and over in our country.

Never has the opportunity been greater to change education, and never the need more severe to do something about the generational cycle. I come from a background of being an adult literacy tutor, an elementary teacher, an administrator of adult basic education programs, and now a State director of adult basic education programs in Kentucky, and in Kentucky, we realize full well what the

undereducation of adults can do to our society and our economy, because we have the dubious distinction of leading the Nation in percentage of people who have less than a high school diploma. Forty-seven percent of our population has less than a high school credential, and we are also well aware of that cycle as we watch the youngsters of these parents who have not completed high school drop out at a rate of approximately 30 percent, and in some cases as high as 60 percent in our counties with the highest incident of undereducation.

I think it's been said enough times today that research indicates that two of the most critical factors in influencing a child's success in school are the educational attainment of that parent and the economic situation of that home. The family situation keeps cropping up as the major contributor to failure of youngsters in elementary and secondary schools.

In a 3-year research project conducted in Kentucky in our adult literacy programs, we tried to validate that statistic even more fully. We looked at the adults who were coming back to us, and this was a random sample of adults. When we looked at those literacy students, we found that the average student had completed 9 years of school, and the average reading level was below second grade.

So we were looking at adults who were returning to us who as youngsters had failed in our educational system. They had been in elementary and secondary schools and public education but had not succeeded. We tried to find out why. We took a look at the educational level of their parents, and we found that less than 1 percent of their parents had ever completed high school. The average parent had completed between 4 and 8 years of school. So the generational cycle was repeating itself.

Through those statistics and through student comments that I've heard in my 15-year involvement with literacy students, we find that the cycle is repeating itself to the point that we cannot continue to put money just in remedial programs in elementary and secondary, but most get to the root of the cause.

One father summed up his comment by saying, "My 3-year old comes after supper to sit on my lap. She wants me to read a story book to her. I get so mad at myself because I can't read that I just push her away. She doesn't understand, but I just can't help myself. I feel like crying."

From these and other such responses, we can see the importance of starting early in the child and parent learning partnership with preschool youngsters in combination with their parents, and not wait until that child comes to elementary school.

We see also that emotional problems may be caused in the home by this lack of self esteem of an adult who cannot read. Further studies in that same program tried to find out why these adult students thought they hadn't learned to read in school, because obviously they had been in our public school system.

When we asked those same adults what the major reason was that they had not learned to read in school, the major reason was the family itself rather than the instruction. It could be summed up as a lack of supportive encouragement in the home, lack of modeling in the home and lack of a stimulating environment due

to economic deprivation. We know that undereducation of adults breeds economic deprivation.

We know facts, like percentage of high school graduates, people who have not graduated from high school, are four times more likely to be unemployed than high school graduates. We know that nonhigh school graduates can expect to earn $8,000 less a year if they are employed. So we know that undereducation contributes to economic deprivation, and consequently to success in school.

In that same program, we looked at ability to read and related that to unemployment, and we found that of those adults reading around a first-grade level, that they were 90 percent unemployment rate, and when we looked at somebody who was reading just at fifth grade level, we found that they were three times more likely to be employed just with that rate of reading.

So while we can't say that teaching a person to read can insure a job or insure that their family will not be economically deprived, we can certainly say there is a direct correlation.

So it's apparent from these and other studies that our efforts must take a dual approach. Unless we change the educational level of the parents, and more importantly, the value they place on education, we're treating only symptoms and not causes.

We need to design good parent programs, such as those proposed as models in the Even Start bill. Research shows that early childhood education programs that involved parents have the most lasting effects on the education of the children, but our experience shows us that it's very difficult to get meaningful parent involvement.

We have some excellent programs around this country, but very few of them are widespread, and few of them are addressing the issues of the basic skills needs of the adult parent. We need a national emphasis on this issue.

The Even Start bill addresses these issues and insures that there's a stringent evaluation component, and I applaud that part of that bill, because then we can take those strategies and validate them and take them nationwide and help others create such programs.

I applaud the intent to rigorously evaluate the proposed models, particularly the requirement of submission of data to the National Diffusion Network. As a developer of a nationally validated Jefferson County Adult Reading Program, I have seen firsthand the effects that the dissemination of that group, the NDN, can have on educational improvement. In Kentucky, that National Adult Validated Literacy Program is now going to be used as one component of a model program that is going to be developed that could very easily fit the kind of model programs proposed in the Even Start bill.

This program will bring the parent into a school setting with a preschool youngster, and if that program is successful, it could expect to raise the educational level of the parents of the preschool children through basic skill instruction so that we could turn that around in the home. It would enhance their parenting skills. It would increase the developmental skills of the preschool youngster, because they would be working with a developmental child specialist while their parents were working with an adult educator.

It would enable parents to become familiar with and comfortable in the school setting so that when their youngsters were in elementary school, they would not be fearful of that school. They would be comfortable in that situation and take some ownership in their child's learning.

It would provide for the child a model in the home of the value of learning, and it would enhance the relationship of the parent and the child through planned structure interaction. If such results could be achieved in that program and in other programs throughout this country, we could turn things around in education. But, the major roadblock for that program in Kentucky, that proposed program, and the major roadblock throughout this country for such programs is funding.

State resources fall far short of the need to accommodate remedial programs, special programs, and elementary and secondary education. The deficiencies far exceed the resources to meet those deficiencies, and Federal funds could accomplish a great deal in developing the model programs to address the partnership of parental and preschool education.

Resources from the Federal level could be channeled through the existing legislation in the Adult Education Act. The Adult Education Act currently enables States to provide basic literacy skill instruction to the Nation's adult population.

Last year, more than 2 million adults took advantage of the opportunity to gain basic and life coping skills through the program, and the Adult Education Act provides the network to teach parenting as well as basic skills. The act also provides for funding of national research and demonstration projects under section 309. This section under current authority is broad enough to support the model program development as proposed in the Even Start bill. As much as 5 percent of the adult education appropriation can be used for section 309 when the adult education appropriation reaches $112 million.

So for an additional $10 million added to the Adult Education Act, thousands more adults could be served nationwide. We could better address our adult literacy needs and model programs to be developed through section 309.

This additional funding is essential if we are to break the intergenerational cycle of undereducation, and we need a national emphasis on this issue. The intent of this bill is excellent, but the proposal to take $1 million away from the only program that is currently addressing the needs of undereducated adults, a program that is already desperately underfunded is not the solution.

The adult basic education network should be used, but the appropriation level should be increased. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Sharon Darling follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SHARON DARLING, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF ADULT AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION, KENTUCKY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mr. Chairman and members of the sub-committee. I appreciate the opportunity to testify before you today on issues that are so important to the future of education in this nation. Never has the opportunity been greater in this country to improve education and never the need greater to devise a plan to break the intergenerational cycle of undereducation.

The undereducation of the adult population in this country seriously affects our ability to ensure that the future generation has the skills to enable the country to realize its full economic, educational and social potential.

In Kentucky we realize the critical need for adult education because we are last in the nation in the percentage of our adult population without a high school credential (47%). We also realize the devastating effects of undereducated adults and the cycle it creates as we witness 33 percent of our 9th graders entering high school not completing the 12th grade and a significant number of those graduating from high school without the necessary education skills to obtain employment or compete for entry into post-secondary education.

Numerous national research studies, validate the statistics on the effects of our undereducated parents by demonstrating that the educational achievement of the child in school is linked more closely to the family's educational attainment and economic status than to any other variable. Recent studies conducted in 1980 further point to the critical need to improve the family situation by reporting that home background is the most important factor correlated with a child's school success (Bloom, 1981; Bronfenbrenner, 1970). Additionally it is reported that 90 percent of children are underachievers because parents are not routinely prepared for their responsibilities. (White, 1980).

In a three year research project conducted in the adult literacy programs in Kentucky, the evidence of the effects of the undereducation of the adult population on their off-spring was apparent. The study was conducted over a three year period through taped individual interviews with adult literacy students, and the statistics as well as the adult student comments point to the serious need to design programs proposed in the Even-Start Bill.

The random sample of adult literacy students in this Kentucky study showed that the average student had completed 8.7 years of formal education, was below the age of 30 and had reading skills slightly below the 2nd grade level. These were the students who had failed in our regular school setting.

In an attempt to discover their reason for failure, information was collected on their parent's level of education and their own opinion of why they failed to learn in school. It was found that less than one percent of the parents of the undereducated adults had ever completed high school, and the average educational attainment of the parent was between 4 and 8 years of school. The generational cycle of undereducation repeated itself and failure in education was closely linked to the student's parents and grandparents who had failed before them.

In the students own words about how the lack of functional literacy affects their relationship with their children, one father summed up the frustration by saying, "My three year old wants to sit in my lap and let me read a story to her. I get so mad at myself because I can't read that I just push her away. She doesn't understand, but I just can't help myself. I feel like crying." From these and other such responses, we can see the importance of starting early in the child and parent learning partnership. The process needs to begin in the early childhood years and not be postponed until the child reaches elementary school.

Further studies in Kentucky's adult education program concerning why the illiterate adult students did not learn to read in school indicated that the reason most often stated concerned the family and the lack of supportive encouragement and positive modeling in the home as well as a lack of stimulating environment due to economic deprivation.

Economic deprivation is tied closely to the educational level of attainment of our adult parents and taxpayers. Correlations have often been made between grade completion and economic success and those studies show that adults who do not possess a high school diploma can expect to have a four times greater chance to be unemployed than a high school graduate. Additionally, non-high school graduates who are employed will earn $8,000 less annually than their counterparts with a high school education. In the Kentucky literacy program actual reading level was equated to employment and it was found that a direct correlation existed between literacy level and employment status.

Those adults reading below 2nd grade showed an unemployment rate of 90 percent and were three times more likely to be unemployed than those adults who attained even a 5th grade reading level.

It is apparent from these and other studies that efforts for educational and economic reform must take a dual approach. Unless we change the educational level of the parents and more importantly the value they place on education, we are treating only symptoms and not causes. We cannot fully succeed economically or educationally.

It is difficult to design a good parent and child program to alleviate the cause. Research shows that early childhood programs that involve parents have the most lasting effect on the children. But experience shows that meaningful parent involvement is very difficult to obtain. When a child attends a preschool center, the parent tends to leave the child in the hands of the "expert", and it is very difficult to substantially involve the parents in the program except as an outsider.

Some programs throughout the country have succeeded and continue to succeed in providing parent involvement in preschool education, but these programs are not widespread and rarely address the educational needs of the parents. A national emphasis is needed to make a substantial difference in breaking the cycle. Adult educators need to work as partners with early childhood specialists to design model programs which appeal to the recognized needs of the parent first, and bring the child in to benefit from the parent's learning. This kind of program to raise basic skill levels of the parents can change the value they place on education and provide a model for educational success in the home. The Even-Start Plan addresses these issues and ensures strigent evaluation.

I applaud the intent to rigorously evaluate the programs and particularly the requirement of submission of data to the National Diffusion Network. As the developer of the nationally validated Jefferson County Adult Literacy Program, I have seen the effects of the NDN's dissemination on improving education programs nationwide.

In Kentucky, the National Diffusion Network Adult Literacy Program is proposed to be used in a new program called the Parent and Child Education Program. This program focuses on bringing undereducated parents together in a learning environment with their preschool children. The program will provide both basic literacy skills and parenting skills for the adult and developmental skills for the child. The results of such programs, if operated in a regular school setting, could expect to achieve the following:

1. Raise the educational level of the parents of preschool children through instruction in basic skills.
2. Enhance parenting skills.
3. Increase developmental skills of preschool children to better prepare them for academic success.
4. Enable parents to become familiar with and comfortable in the school setting.
5. Provide a role model for the child of parental interest in education.
6. Enhance the relationship of the parent and child through planned structured interaction.
7. Demonstrate to parents their power to affect their child's ability to learn.

If such results are achieved, the program will go far to improve the education and economy of our state. The major roadblock is funding for such a program. Resources from the federal level could be channeled through the existing legislation in the Adult Education Act. The Adult Education Act currently enables states to provide basic skill education to the nation's adult population. Last year, more than two million adults took advantage of the opportunity to gain basic and life coping skills through this program. The Adult Education Act provides the network to provide parenting, as well as, basic skills to the undereducated adult.

The Act also provides for the funding for national research and development activities under Section 309 which under current authority is broad enough to support the model program development as proposed in the "Even-Start Act". As much as 5 percent of the adult education appropriation can be used for Section 309 when the adult education appropriation reaches 112 million. For an additional 10 million added to the Adult Education Act thousands more adults could be served nationwide and model programs could be developed to break the intergenerational cycle of undereducation that is so essential to our growth as a nation.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you, Ms. Darling. The next witness is Ms. Nancy Woods. Ms. Woods, we welcome you.

STATEMENT OF MS. NANCY WOODS, PROJECT COORDINATOR, ADULT LITERACY PROJECT, PENNSYLVANIA

Ms. WOODS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to be here and share my view of what I have found in adult education.

I am the director of Adult Literacy Action which is a local literacy program in Beaver County which has a high unemployment

rate and steel mills closing down on a regular basis around us. Since 1978, my local program has served more than 1,500 adults who are functionally illiterate.

I also wear the hat of State volunteer literacy director as a special intersection of Pennsylvania Association for Adult Continuing Ed, and our intersection, entitled "Tutors of Literacy in the Commonwealth" has 67 literacy councils in Pennsylvania which in 1984 served more than 9,000 functionally illiterate adults, and a third hat that I wear is field laboratory coordinator for Penn State University's Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy, trying to do research and evaluation on adult education problems.

So, as I come into this program, I'd like to talk about an aspect that we've designed in Beaver County where I work with functionally illiterate parents who have children enrolled in the ECIA chapter 1 remedial reading programs in our local school district. Our division director for Federal programs in the Pennsylvania Department of Education was able to get special permission from the U.S. Department of Education to use administrative funds from the chapter 1 budget to assist my program to help parents achieve basic literacy skills in order to help their children with homework and other school related needs.

The classes not only taught the basic skills the parents lacked, but also endeavored to help parents transfer these skills to their children. Additional objectives included the enhancement of the role of the parents' attitude in the child's success in school. An integral part of the study included discussion of effects of absenteeism, parent/teacher/child cooperation, how self esteem relates to learning, and the ongoing practice in meeting homework related problems the families faced with their children.

Each of the parents repeatedly reported the individual success stories of this effort in their children's lives. Examples included one mother of a middle school child who related the fact that before she enrolled in our program, she found herself constantly being called to the principal's office regarding discipline problems with her child.

Since she has been involved in our program, she has not returned to the school once. Most of the parents were surprised at how much help they are now able to provide for their children. The types of things that we found within this program, as we worked with the parents, were things such as when one mother had come to me before our program began, and she called me, and said, "Nancy, may I come and talk to you?"

When she came in to see me, she said, "You know, my little boy is in first grade, and this is the first time he ever missed school. Nancy, I know I should be writing an absentee excuse, but I'm a single parent, and I couldn't do anything to help him, so I sent him to school saying he didn't need one. He came home the next night reminding me he had to have an absentee excuse for the next day. I sent him back telling him he didn't need it, because I couldn't write it. The third night he came home, and he cried before he went to bed that he wasn't going to go back to school, because the teacher had been making him put his head on his desk during recess until he quit being so careless as to forget to bring his excuse to school."

Well, I immediately sat down with this mother and we wrote several excuses that said, "Johnny was absent because he was sick," not a great excuse, but it gave her something that if the boy was absent again that she could use until she had developed the skills to write these excuses on her own.

So as we worked with the parents in the parent literacy program, we worked on things like writing an absentee excuse that would say, "Blank was absent because of a blank," and in the first blank putting the names of the children, in the second blank putting a sore throat, a stomach ache, the other things that they might need, that these parents just have no idea how to write on their own or even how to use the dictionary to find the skills.

In addition to that, working with them to teach them the skills to be able to do this on their own, but if they feel good about their ability to relate to the schools, we're going to enhance the child's attitude in working with the school.

So we work in that aspect in cooperation with the schools, and in a second aspect where we had a program in our Riverside School District had chapter 1 teachers working with the parents once a month. They would bring the parents in to work on an aspect of hands on, saying, "This is what your child is going to be doing in homework." Then they would invite the children into the class, work with the parents, and make the assignment.

The parents and children would work together with the teachers watching, and then the children would go back to class and work with their teachers. Then the parents and the chapter 1 teacher would work on what the parents had felt they couldn't work with their children on.

Seeing the difference that the parents felt in their ability to help their children cope with the problems in the school, I brought with me four records, a basis of how we have designed our chapter 1 parent literary program, our instructor evaluations, our testing reports, and some of the things that we have worked on in Beaver County.

One of the things that I have found, as based on my personal experience of serving more than 1,500 adult new readers in Beaver County, I feel that much more emphasis should be placed on school involvement of low level adult readers in assisting their children from preschool, perhaps even as high as junior high in the learning process.

The willingness of many basic literacy programs in Pennsylvania to cooperate with the chapter 1 programs provides an exciting possibility for improving the potential of regaining the pride of becoming a literate society as a nation of readers.

One of the things that I would say if we're working with 4, 5, 6, 7, 8-year-olds is looking, how are we going to recruit these parents. Are we going to be able to get the ones that we need involved in this program. A lot of parents that I'm involved with have kids in older grades. In younger grades, they fake their way through. They pretend they were reading stories, but as adults, they're seeing their kids failing in elementary school and even the middle schools.

This is the incentive to say now, I need to help my child. So they're coming in with a much higher degree of motivation to be recruited into a program. So I think expanding the level to the

point where the parents are finally realizing now I need to be involved needs to be one consideration of this particular bill.

I think another thing that we could possibly look at is standardizing evaluations. We're using the Bather exam now across the State trying to see how this relates to testing the parents and children and building the cooperation of all of the groups together. Thank you.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you. We were merely commenting on one statement you made which was intriguing to the members of the committee. We'll go back to that during the question period, I'm sure.

The last witness is Mr. James Miller. Mr. Miller, we welcome you.

STATEMENT OF JAMES MILLER, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF EDUCATION SERVICES, OHIO STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mr. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. My name is James Miller. I represent the Ohio Department of Education, Division of Educational Services, and my colleagues and Senator Chafee did a marvelous job in outlining the issue, so with your permission, I would just like to submit my statement for the record and summarize.

Chairman HAWKINS. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you. Actually I would like to begin with how I was going to close, because something has been missed here, I think, as we discuss this issue, and that is as I look back on nearly 30 years of experience in education as a teacher, as a principal, and a public school administrator, and 20 years of working with the programs enacted by this committee, including title 1, now chapter 1, services to migrant children, services to handicapped children, vocational education, adult literacy, what I see here and what we see here as a State is a marvelous opportunity for national leadership.

I think it's fair to say that without the actions of this committee in previous years, many of the good changes that have happened in American education would not have occurred. What was happening in this country in the late fifties, the early sixties with migrant children was a disgrace until this committee focused on it as a national issue.

The term disadvantaged children was a great topic on sociology classes, but it was not very practical in terms of application to American education until title 1. Adult literacy had its major impetus garnered from this committee in their support of the Adult Education Act.

Certainly in my experience as a public school administrator, prior to 94-142, handicapped children were kept in attics, denied due process and did not have the opportunities that Public Law 94-142 did address, and there is a national leadership role in education.

I know that is not totally popular in all quarters, but for those people who have that perspective, I would remind them that I personally served in the U.S. Air Force, not the Ohio air force, and so there are issues which deserve national attention. I see this being

the beauty of the Even Start legislation, because it addresses an issue which is not a rural issue, it's not an urban issue, it's not a party issue, it's not an issue to the left or right. It's an issue that is faced in every American community, some more than others for sure, more of a problem in Cleveland than it might be in Sylvania, but it is a problem in every Ohio school district. I think the Even Start legislation has the potential of focusing on a national issue that is not necessarily new.

As my colleagues have done so well, they've already talked about programs that are in existence, but they're sporadic, they're scattered, and they don't deal with it on a large basis, and so there is just an absolutely marvelous opportunity through this legislation to address some of the real quality issues that we've been talking about in the recent debate on education.

In my testimony, I included a couple of human stories, because it's a tendency when we think about statistics in terms of talking about 22 million adults or 60 million adults to lose people in sight of that.

The lady in the family that I talked about in my testimony is but one example that can be found in every State in this country. That, as you will note, happened to be a lady of 33 years of age, looked in her midfifties, four children, two at school, two at home. The children in school were already low in attendance, already been identified as low achievers, already in a chapter 1 program, title 1 program at that point in time. Conditions in the home were less than desirable. There was evidence of malnutrition when you were there. I won't even site the example that I saw during my visit to the home. Examples of abuse, because when the mother wanted to enroll in the ABE program, the husband at that time beat her, because he didn't want her coming back to school.

To make a long story short, after this lady came back to the literacy program, obtained her GED, you saw some rather profound changes with the children. The children who were in school started to attend regularly, became less of a discipline problem. Their achievement increased. The two children at home entered school far better prepared to succeed.

I don't think it's surprising, the husband eventually entered a GED program, and became a deputy sheriff in that county which shocked a number of people, but it's an example of how combining literacy of parents and programs for kids combined to save a family. I don't know how you put that in dollars and cents, I really don't.

At our cost in Ohio of $125 a head for 150 hours of instruction, it seems to be we can sorely afford not to invest in such programs. One example I didn't include which deals with the self-esteem and dignity aspect that addresses both parents and children for a child whose parents can't read to him, it's tough to tell that to the kids at school. For the adult who can't help a child, it's a terrible psychological thing.

I happened to be visiting one of our programs in Cleveland, when a man 45 years of age actually wrote his name for the first time, and had begun the process of reading.

The next day, when he came to class, he came wearing, believe it or not, a Harvard sweatshirt and carrying a briefcase. Now, I'm

sorry, Mr. Goodling and Mr. Hawkins, it was not a UCLA sweatshirt or Penn State given your stature in the top 10 now, and we chuckled when that occurred, but doesn't that say a lot about the dignity and self-esteem issue that a human being feels that he knows now that he has the tools to help himself.

In previous testimony before this committee, you had Jonathan Kozol here and you had Don McCune from California and some outstanding witnesses talking about the literacy issue. You've heard a lot about the costs, the costs in terms of dollars and cents to our economy through the unrealized income, I think the last figure was a $237 billion estimate, the cost to business and industry in terms of accidents on the job due to the inability of workers to read, this may come as a shock to you. I can't speak to the Three Mile Island incident in Pennsylvania as to the causes of that, but I can tell you that the atomic energy plant at Piketon, OH, we were running a literacy program for employees, and that went on for a number of years.

The cost to the legal profession and the cost to health insurance, not counting the staggering human cost, children do succeed even though their parents are illiterate, but start to look at the balance on that, so the costs are staggering, and we all pay for it. I don't believe it's a liberal issue to be concerned about the quality of education in Lexington or Pittsburgh or Philadelphia if I happen to live in Freemont, OH. If it's not quality there, then we all pay for it.

So I really couldn't, if I had a dream as I look ahead in education in terms of what could be done in the future, if the Even Start concept could be implemented in every school district or most school districts in this country, we would take a giant step forward in addressing the real quality issues.

I repeat this is not a black issue, it's not a Hispanic issue, it's not a poor white issue. It touches all communities, farm, city and the like, so it's just absolutely crucial. We really appreciate as one State this legislation being advanced, and we encourage the committee to continue the leadership role that you've had in addressing the substantive issues, and we encourage you to do that, and we'll support you in anyway we can.

I appreciate the opportunity to talk with you today. Thank you.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of James W. Miller follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JAMES W. MILLER, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF EDUCATION SERVICES, OHIO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, my name is James Miller, Director of Educational Services for the Ohio Department of Education. On behalf of Dr. Franklin B. Walter, our State Superintendent of Public Instruction, I thank you for this opportunity to appear before you to speak on behalf of the proposed Even Start legislation. I have been involved with adult literacy and Chapter 1 programs since 1966. I have also served as President of the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education and hope to provide both a state and national perspective for your consideration.

Before moving to specific comments about the Even Start proposal, I would like to begin by commending the chairman and the Members of the Committee for your continued support of Chapter 1 and Adult Basic Education (ABE) for the past twenty years. These words are not said to merely compliment the Committee. They are said to convey our deep appreciation for your leadership in supporting programs

which have made a tremendous impact, both personally and economically, on the lives of several hundred thousand Ohio children and adults.

The Even Start proposal at long last recognizes on a national level the importance of linking adult literacy programs with programs for preschool age children to simultaneously address the educational needs of both parents and children. The research linking the success of children in school to the economic and educational levels of these parents has been clear for many years.

The most important feature of the Even Start bill is that it would create national attention on and awareness of the problem. The bill addresses a concept that is long overdue in what should become a basic component of educational planning and programming at the local school district level. The major strength of this bill is its potential for creating a national effort to focus on a problem which exists in nearly every community in this nation.

True, the program proposed in this legislation is not a brand new concept. Programs such as those suggested by this legislation are already being conducted in a small number of communities througout this nation. You will hear testimony today from some witnesses who are already involved in such programs. However, current efforts are sporadic at best and totally inadequate to meet the major needs that exist today. We are not talking about a small number of adults and children who need help. A study done at the University of Texas identified a total of 23 million adults who could be considered functionally illiterate. Other studies indicate a more commonly accepted estimate of 60 million adults who are functionally or marginally illiterate. Multiply the last estimate by just two children per family times 30 million families (which is low and which does not take into account the large numbers of single parents involved) and it becomes readily apparent that as many as 60 million children or more are negatively impacted by the low literacy level of their parents. In Ohio alone, according to 1980 U.S. Census data, more than 2,200,000 adults have less than a high school diploma.

Other strengths of the bill include its emphasis on identifying medical, nutritional, or other social problems which might burden a child's success in school, its focus on adult literacy needs and not just parenting skills, its direct linkage of Adult Basic Education and Chapter 1, its ties to high unemployment rates and to high concentrations of disadvantaged children, its review panel comprised of practitioners, its requirement for fiscal support and continuation of services by the grantee, and an appropriate evaluation requirement.

It is suggested that the program should be administered jointly by Chapter 1 and ABE staff in the Department of Education so a national linkage could be created from the very beginning.

While there is a concern about the source and amount of funding for this proposal, dwelling on funding at this time is counterproductive to the large issue which this bill addresses—the all important relationship of adult literacy to the success of children in school by linking together ABE and Chapter 1. However, costs inevitably become a discussion point; therefore, I would like to speak to the real costs to this nation, both in human and economic terms.

First, it should be recognized that we all pay for the costs derived from illiterate adults and children who fail in school—we pay directly and indirectly in many different ways.

We pay directly through the billions of dollars which go to child welfare costs and unemployment compensation. A significant portion of these costs can be attributed to adults who lack the basic skills necessary for available employment.

The impact of illiteracy directly affects other areas such as the U.S. military, correctional systems, legal costs, health claims and serives, insurance costs, and the publishing industry to mention just a few.

For example, according to Jonathan Kozol, author of *Illiterate America*, 85 percent of juveniles who come before the court and 60 percent of prison inmates read below the fifth grade level. Our correctional costs are in the billions of dollars and growing rapidly. The costs of business and industry for insurance and damages related to on-the-job accidents due to employees' lack of basic skills runs into billions. According to Kozol, the costs of the Pentagon in preparing the manuals for the B-1 bomber program will exceed one billion dollars.

We pay directly and indirectly due to lost human potential. Human costs are as staggering as the economic costs. True, some adults succeed as well a children despite the limitations of the educational background in the home. Some very gifted Americans such as Henry Ford, Jack London, Bill Mauldin, Will Rogers, Orville and Wilbur Wright, and George Gershwin were high school dropouts. How much similar potential is this society missing among the millions of adults and children who are the potential clients of programs addressed by the Even Start proposal?

For those of us who take reading for granted, it is almost impossible to put ourselves in the place of someone who can't. For example, can you picture what it would be like to be unable to read to your child, unable to use the freeway because you can't read exit signs, or to read bills, or to use a telephone directory, or to read instructions on a bottle of medicine, or to read a menu, or to vote? How do you measure these adults lack of dignity and selfesteem because they can't read?

Let me share one example with you which illustrates the impact of a family approach to education. In a rural Ohio ABE program, a lady was enrolled who was thirty-three years of age but could easily have been judged to be in her mid-fifties. Both she and her husband were unemployed and neither had completed school. She had dropped out during elementary school. There were four children in the family, two in school and two still at home. The two children in school already had attendance problems, were low achievers, and were already identified as potential dropouts. When I first entered the home, there was evidence of nutritional problems with the younger children and the home was generally not very clean or well kept. It was the picture of a family headed for disaster.

The woman eventually passed the GED test and became employed as a teacher's aide in the elementary school. Her husband, who originally was adamantly opposed to her coming back to school and who beat her one occasion because of it, eventually earned his GED and found employment. An interesting change occurred with the children. They began to attend school regularly, diets improved, grades improved, and their entire attitude toward school changed in a positive way. The two younger children didn't experience the problems their older brother and sister did and began school on a far more successful note. This one example can be found time and time again in adult literacy programs throughout the nation. Our cost per 150 hours of instruction in Ohio is $125.00, a rather small investment when one considers the cost of not offering the service.

The overriding issue when one looks at the Even Start proposal is the need to consider what really is at stake to this society. The problems of adult illiteracy and its negative impact on children touches every community, even those who would prefer to pretend that "we don't have that problem in our community." We all share in the economic and human costs as taxpayers, neighbors, friends, and sometimes as relatives.

It bears repeating that the importance of this bill is that it not only impacts parents, but equally addresses the toll taken on the children of functionally illiterate adults. Simply stated, children of illiterate parents do not come to school prepared to succeed. Certainly, some do succeed, but they are the exceptions.

Children from such homes are simply not ready for school and equally tragic, the parents can't help them now or tomorrow. What's missing is hard to understand for those of us who have come from more conventional upbringings. Illiterate parents cannot read to their children, they frequently do not or cannot afford to provide books, they have no skills in supervising or helping their children organize studies, and they are uncomfortable with schools and school teachers. All too often these parents have a negative reaction toward learning and school.

The problems with children go beyond success in school. As stated in a recent report issued by the Education Commission of the States, a growing number of our nation's young people are not making successful transitions to productive adult lives as workers and parents. The report addresses the impact of the shrinking number of adults entering the work force, the costs of training (much of it remedial in nature) that business and industry is spending now and the high costs that are sure to come, and the fact that the problem is not just a minority problem or a rural problem. It is a problem which reaches into every corner of this nation.

The report emphasizes the importance of placing greater effort on early childhood education and a greater emphasis on improving education for the disadvantaged youth of our nation and those who are at risk. Who is at risk? We all are.

Statistics show that these students are prime targets to become dropouts or failures. They in turn will become the underemployed, marginally literate parents of a new generation of students, who in turn, will enter the schools without the minimum competencies to succeed. The cycle will go on and on as long as the crucial educational and economic link between the parent and child is not an integral part of our school programs. The Even Start proposal is well named because it addresses one of the most critical needs of our society, the opportunity for children from homes with functionally illiterate parents to have an even chance with other students. I know of no issue more important than this one for the Congress and this Committee to consider.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak on behalf of this issue and would be pleased to respond to any questions you may have.

Chairman HAWKINS. Perhaps we might direct questions to Ms. Paratore in the event she has to leave. I feel confident that what is being suggested is an excellent program, and I certainly commend the author, Mr. Goodling, on what he is proposing.

I have some difficulties with the way it is being financed, the proposal to finance it the way it is, which I suppose gets back into looking at some of the other programs as well.

Now, Ms. Paratore, you did indicate that, and I'm reading through your prepared statement, that entering school without the same foundation enjoyed by children of literate parents, these children begin at a disadvantage, and the cycle of illiteracy continues.

We certainly have no disagreement with that statement. However, we are now talking about, in effect, using moneys which are limited, moneys which are already available to prepare students for entering school at the age 3 and 4, but we're not reaching hardly enough to make a real dent.

Now, you would be, in effect, proposing that we dissipate some of that money and begin to share it with the parents, which again we have no objections to that, but can we, in effect, or how do we make a decision whether or not you want to take money away from children who are now beginning at an early age to do what we should be doing for every child, and begin to put it elsewhere, to put it on parents who if we had been putting it on those parents when they were children, in the first instance, they would be readers and be able to do what we now say we are going to do at a later age and make up. That begins to cause me a little problem, because I think we are not going to reach a large number of parents either, a very limited number, and obviously that is desirable, but we are taking it away in the first instance from where it should be, and we're not solving the problem.

I think the last witness, Mr. Miller, indicated that what we're doing, we're doing at a financial disadvantage in terms of the use of taxpayers' money, because we're going to pay for it anyway.

Now this is the problem that concerns me. I know that chapter 1 is well established, a cost-effective program. So far as I know no one has criticized that program. Now how would you answer a skeptic who would address such a problem to you, and I ask you just what would you do if you were sitting in a position here in Congress to make a decision?

Dr. PARATORE. Mr. Chairman, I share your concerns, and, in fact, when I first learned of the Even Start bill, my primary concern with it was that funding for children would be diminished. My background is as an educator of children, not as an educator of adults, and it was not until I learned of Senator Chafee's version of the bill that I agreed to come here today.

I do not think that we can diminish chapter 1 funding. As a former director of chapter 1, I know firsthand the success of that program.

I, again, support the changes which I am advised will be put into effect when Mr. Goodling and Mr. Chafee revise this bill.

Chairman HAWKINS. We certainly would like to work with them and with others and with yourself in that regard, because what I have said does not in anyway take away from what I consider to be

a very viable idea and how we solve it financially is really my main concern.

Dr. PARATORE. I agree.

Chairman HAWKINS. I will pass that with the other witnesses in the meantime. Mr. Goodling?

Mr. GOODLING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I had indicated earlier, of course, we've been treading very, very lightly on the financing of the program realizing the year we are in. I'm not as concerned as perhaps others are in relationship to would we take something from chapter 1, would we take something from adult education, simply because it's exactly the same people that we are working with in this program.

I think in this program what we are basically saying is, sure, adult education is good. Chapter 1 has been doing well, but shouldn't we come up with some new ideas, some different approaches, and in my estimation this is basically what we're doing here. We're not suggesting something totally new, as you heard, a program in Pennsylvania already exists, and I also had a program along these lines. Basically we're saying we're working with the very same people that you're talking about in chapter 1. We're working with the very same people that you're talking about in adult education, and let's look at some different approaches.

But, most importantly, let's get something out there now while people are thinking about illiteracy and whet their appetite, so that, as I said, that big bill that I want to introduce in the near future, they'll be ready for it. Otherwise, it will be a real shock when that comes.

You basically said, I think, what I'm trying to do. You said, "Through this process, we engage in an intergenerational approach to literacy and link instruction for illiterate adults with a prevention program for their children." I just think if we don't really talk about that prevention program, and we can't talk about the prevention program if we only deal with children. We have to deal with both at the same time. That's what we're trying to do.

I think the thing that probably got me more stirred than anything else was the advertisement, and some of you have heard me say this before, where the little girl crawled up on daddy's lap on television, and daddy was going to read to her. The only problem was that he'd go about two words, and then the little girl would have to give him the next word, because he couldn't read that next word, and the next word, neither of them could read.

I didn't complete my statement earlier, because I was trying to move rapidly so that we didn't hold up the Senator, but I should have indicated then that NEA has endorsed the program, and that Secretary Bennett in a letter to me stated, "We welcome the introduction of new and creative approaches which can be accomplished through the existing system."

Chairman HAWKINS. May I ask whether or not he might have been talking about vouchers?

Mr. GOODLING. He knows my feelings. NEA just came back in so they missed that compliment. They'll have to read the record. Basically, you know, what he says through existing systems, is one of the things that I want as we move in this attempt to eradicate illiteracy.

I think if we have a fault on the Federal level over the past years, it's been that we have set up separate systems all the time. We've gotten so much money out there to those who have to set up these new systems when we already had people in place who could have handled it.

So I'm sure when he's talking about existing systems, he's also talking about existing present money. When I'm talking about existing systems, I'm talking about let's not go out and look for new systems or new administrative units. We already have the people out there who are doing the work, and if we can coordinate, we'll save an awful lot of money, and that money will go to children and adult illiterates rather than to an administrative staff to carry out those. I want to thank all of you for your testimony. It sounds like an exciting experience up in the Penn State area, and I'm not talking about them being No. 1, because I didn't believe that until Saturday's game changed my mind somewhat, but the program that you were talking about. So I thank all of you for coming and testifying.

Chairman HAWKINS. We'll get to the other witnesses, Mr. Goodling, but let us try to direct questions to Dr. Paratore.

Mr. PERKINS. I would just point out to the Doctor she's got 38 minutes to get to the airport, so if she wants to hit the road, there is no offense taken in this corner.

Dr. PARATORE. Thank you. I have a 1 o'clock speech or I would be pleased to stay. Thank you.

Chairman HAWKINS. Again, we appreciate your appearance, and at this point if there are no further questions of you, you may depart on your schedule. Thank you.

Dr. PARATORE. Thank you very much.

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. Goodling, do you want to continue with the other witnesses?

Mr. GOODLING. Yes, I did want to ask one thing. As we develop this large literacy program, of course, community involvement is going to be very, very important, and, of course, tapping into the already existing and expanding volunteer element.

I guess I would first ask Ms. Woods whether since you also wear a hat for volunteers, how much community involvement did you get into your program beyond those who were paid.

Ms. WOODS. In the way of volunteers, we had more than 1,000 volunteers. At the present time in Beaver County, I have approximately 200 volunteers actively teaching one on one with adults who wanted to learn to read.

I work with our intermediate unit, our chapter 1 parent literacy program was sponsored through the intermediate unit funding source. I work with our community college on referring students to pre-GED and GED programs.

We have contacts working within the sheltered workshops with mental health, mental retardation. On a State level, we've been working with the ESL bilingual on a possibility as they use their Merlin tracking system as the migrant workers go throughout the region how we could work this in with adult basic education components. I've worked with college teachers of reading, and with our public school teachers on ways they can use their educational support to help us to work with curriculum intergration, specialized

techniques that would support the volunteer efforts, ongoing small math classes, professional teachers working as volunteers, and instead of taking one student, perhaps teaching a small class of 15 adults with a math program or a grammar and logic class, a creative writing class.

We are now developing a program where I will be doing a 4-week study circle with our unemployed steelworkers and other students on developing critical thinking skills in relationship to national issues. We work with our newspaper. We're piloting a program on teaching people to read by using the newspaper, so the community support and linkages have been outstanding.

Mr. GOODLING. Ms. Darling, I would be particularly interested in hearing from you since you stated some rather startling statistics in relation to your State.

How do you go about getting the illiterate adult to want to participate, or first of all I guess to even know that a program is available. Certainly you don't send out printed material to them, and second, how do you overcome this stigma so that you actually get them willing to participate.

Ms. DARLING. I think that was one of the strengths of the program that was developed and nationally validated was really in its recruitment effort, because obviously we can't teach them if we can't get them there and keep them there.

The recruitment efforts that we tried in an urban area were a little bit different than what might work in a rural area, and we've found as we've traveled around the country to train, but I would like to say first in an urban area that what we used was the electronic media, but we didn't use the electronic media as the source of entry into programs.

In other words, a person could watch television or hear something on radio, and call a number and remain anonymous on that telephone, and then the counseling process would start. So we used a great deal of counseling in that recruitment effort to really try to implant that success, that impending success that this adult student would feel.

I think during the first month of our recruitment in 1978 I must have talked to at least 500 adult students over the telephone. Each of them went through a process of trying to let that person on the end of the phone know that they were not stupid, that they had failed in school for a certain reason, so they had to get over their fears first of all. They wanted to know things, like will I have to read out loud, what's going to happen to me there. So we used electronic media just as a way of letting that student remain anonymous.

We had a great deal of support from business and industry and continue to, and from our community resources. We have banks. We have all people involved in our recruitment efforts. In a rural area, sometimes our adults want to guard their secret a little more closely, and we need to go directly to them and work through oftentimes the schools to find some of the parents and talk with them one on one, and it's more of a referral process by word of mouth. The electronic media is still important, but I think to speak to these people is important to a greater extent.

Mr. GOODLING. It seems that whenever there are children who need help, you're always there, whether it's in this case illiterates or whether it's migrant workers or whomever it may be. We appreciate you as an excellent resource person in helping this committee.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you very much, Mr. Goodling. I appreciate that. I meant to call attention to a report which you may find to be of interest. It's called Reconnecting Youth. It's done by the education commission of the States. It's just released. It's an excellent report. It talks about the need to connect youth not only into the school but into the employment scene. It talks a lot about early childhood education and adults, and provides some very good information which I think you would find useful in the bill.

I did want to add a comment to Sharon's about recruiting adults. You've heard it before about the reasons why adults want to come back to school, and we don't put them in rank of order. One is to read the Bible, not only for religious purposes, but to get in touch with a sense of history and a sense of values they've heard about all their lives, to help their children get better jobs, and to read, that simple. That's something which is often overlooked when we get into the big numbers and so forth.

I appreciate the opportunity to be here, and we wish you well in this endeavor.

Chairman HAWKINS. Mr. Perkins. May the Chair indicate that we can work up until the next bells.

Mr. PERKINS. I'm going to be very brief. I didn't come today really to talk. I came more to listen, because we're in a very preliminary stage of this investigation of what we're going to do. The comments that Mr. Goodling has given over the last year has prodded me along with a preliminary look that we had with the education task force, but probably the major educational problem we face in America today is adult literacy.

How we are going to come to grips with that problem is a question that I'm not sure we have formulated at this time, but I think this is the right approach. I think this is something that breaks the cycle, as we've heard over and over again today.

I think as opposed to attacking it piecemeal, this is a more wholistic approach, and I think on that basis that we're moving in the right direction. I'm not sure I agree with the chairman. I don't agree at this stage with the funding mechanism. I don't know the extent and scope of the program, but I certainly think that this is an area that in the next year and the coming years, we're going to be looking a lot at, and I'm excited about the prospects.

Chairman HAWKINS. That seems to close out the hearing. There are many questions that I'm sure could be asked of these capable witnesses. We do have a vote pending in the House. The Chair would like to express appreciation for the witnesses. You've been extraordinarily helpful to the committee, and since there are no further questions, that terminates the hearing this morning. Thank you very much.

[Whereupon, at 11:13 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

[Additional information submitted for the record follows:]

Prepared Statement of the National Education Association

The National Education Association welcomes the opportunity to submit a statement for the record in support of H.R. 2535, the Even Start Act. Our members—1.7 million elementary, secondary, and higher education employees—are well aware of the important connection between adult illiteracy and student failure. They have seen families fall victim to systemic illiteracy, their captivity continuing through several generations.

The Even Start Act stems from the belief that we must stanch the tide of intergenerational illiteracy. We must do all we can to arm parents with literacy skills so that they can better prepare their children for school, and later support and reinforce their classroom instruction. Programs developed through the Even Start bill would enable parents enrolled in Adult Basic Education programs to acquire the skills necessary to work at home with their Chapter 1-eligible children. It would thus link the education of generations and help break the tragic cycle of illiteracy.

THE PERPETUATION OF ILLITERACY

Systemic illiteracy is much like a large snowball rolling freely down a steep hill. The steeper the hill, the longer and faster the roll, and the larger the ball becomes. Nearly one-third of the adult population is functionally or marginally illiterate. NEA believes we have allowed the illiteracy problem to grow to epidemic proportions. We must begin immediately to halt this tendency toward failure.

Sadly, illiterate parents are hindered in the task of preparing young children to meet the challenge of school. Illiterate parents cannot utilize available written resources to encourage and nurture their children's natural curiosity. Youngsters thus denied the early intellectual stimulation necessary for academic achievement may later be difficult to "turn on" to school.

HOME SHOULD PROVIDE A HEALTHY LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

NEA believes we must ensure a competent professional educator in every classroom across this country. We also believe that a healthy and stimulating home environment is a must. Are children encouraged to read at home? Are youngsters read to? Are parents able to read to their children? These important questions should have affirmative answers. Where they do not, Even Start would provide a mechanism for ensuring yes answers.

EVEN START ACT PROMOTES EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

The Even Start bill is appropriately titled. It promotes equal opportunity in education by providing for the good foundation on which children of illiterate or semiliterate parents can begin their academic training. The Act will nurture the critical link between adult and early childhood education by arming at-risk parents with literacy skills to help them prepare their children for success in school.

NEA RECOMMENDATIONS

NEA supports the goals of the Even Start Act. However, we offer several suggestions that will strengthen the legislation.

Funds for the pilot programs under the Even Start Act should not be taken from existing programs.—The legislation as introduced would take funds from existing Chapter 1 and the Adult Basic Education programs. This robbing of Peter to pay Paul is ill-advised. It would diminish the scope and effectiveness of both programs.

The Chapter 1 program has been a tremendous success. Recent studies have shown that low achievers who have participated in Chapter 1 do significantly better in school than similar children who have not been involved. The National Assessment of Educational Progress reports that reading scores of disadvantaged students rose dramatically over the last decade, and that those gains are attributable to Chapter 1. Despite these impressive gains, however, only 45 percent of the estimated 11 million eligible children are currently served under Chapter 1. In 1982, 790,000 fewer children were served than in 1979—a 15 percent decrease. NEA believes it would be disastrous to further reduce this program.

Chief among federal initiatives to combat adult illiteracy is the Adult Basic Education program designed to help those with substandard skills improve their ability to contribute to society and gain greater earning power. Program content includes such fundamentals as reading, writing, arithmetic, and speaking skills. Despite underfunding and program cuts in recent years, the Adult Basic Education program is

successful. Given the limited impact of this program, adult education funding should not be diminished.

The $3 million funding figure should be increased to accommodate the enormous dimensions of the problem.—NEA believes the federal government should view funding for legislation to combat illiteracy, dropping out of school, and student failure as an investment in the future of our nation. The results of illiteracy and student failure are all too often unemployment, welfare assistance, cirme and incarceration, and lost taxes due to nonproductivity. All these factors adversely affect our economy and the spirit of the nation.

Elementary and secondary education employees should be appointed to the Review Board.—NEA believes the failure to include elementary and secondary education employees on the Review Board is an oversight. A Review Board charged with evaluating Even Start proposals for funding selection cannot be effective without the knowledge and expertise of elementary and secondary education employees.

○